

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

In response to paragraph 4 of the Office Action, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1, 5-7, 14, and 22-23, and amend claim 4 herein.

Regarding the independent claims, the Examiner notes that Berkeley fails to teach cursor brushing and then asserts that North teaches triggering an enhancement of a summary view by cursory brushing. This assertion is incorrect; North does not mention cursor brushing at all. Instead, North teaches a system for selecting medical images using conventional window sliders to move a cutting plane through a set of three-dimensional digital image data to select “slices” for display.

The Examiner has now responded to this argument by asserting that North teaches cursor brushing as defined by the specification by “placing the cursor near or over an entity. In this case the slider to show additional information.” This is also incorrect. North’s slider does not work by merely placing the cursor near or over it. Instead, as stated clearly from the bottom of page 4 to page 5 line 1 of North, “The indicator is attached to a vertical slider widget spanning the height of the overview and can be dragged (...) As the user drags the indicator...”, etc. (emphasis added). The user does not simply place the cursor near or over the indicator but drags the indicator to cause the desired operation. The invention is thus functionally different from the combination of Berkeley and North.

The dependent claims are allowable as amended herein for at least the reasons specified above due to their dependency on independent claims believed to be allowable. Applicants note that the cited prior art is silent as to the use of document metadata other than topic headings for generation of a summary view as taught in the present invention. Claim 4 is amended herein to clarify that distinction. Regarding the Examiner’s assertion that the

limitation of producing a modified version of a document is not claimed, the Examiner is kindly referred to claim 14 which features just such language.

Regarding paragraph 5 and claim 17, Applicants cancel claim 17 herein.

Regarding paragraph 6 and claims 18 and 20, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Liou teaches a system for providing a video directory including a video shot list and representative frames attached to a tree in chronological order for video editing. However, Liou and the other prior art cited, either separately or together, does not teach or suggest an enhancement including a hierarchy of representations or summary views as taught and claimed in the present invention.

All pending claims are believed to be allowable as amended. The prior art made of record and not relied upon has been carefully reviewed. The Examiner is invited to call Applicants' undersigned representative if a telephone conference will expedite the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Andreas Dieberger et al.

By Marc D. McSwain
Marc D. McSwain (#44,929)
Phone (408) 927-3364